

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

2 Sean Pak (Bar No. 219032)

3 seanpak@quinnemanuel.com

4 Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

5 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

6 James Judah (Bar No. 257112)

7 jamesjudah@quinnemanuel.com

8 Lindsay Cooper (Bar No. 287125)

9 lindsaycooper@quinnemanuel.com

10 Iman Lordgooei (Bar No. 251320)

11 imanlordgooei@quinnemanuel.com

12 50 California Street, 22nd Floor

13 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

14 Telephone: (415) 875-6600

15 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

16 Marc Kaplan (*pro hac vice*)

17 marckaplan@quinnemanuel.com

18 191 N. Wacker Drive, Ste 2700

19 Chicago, Illinois 60606

20 Telephone: (312) 705-7400

21 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

22 *Attorneys for GOOGLE LLC*

23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

24 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

25 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

26 SONOS, INC.,

27 Plaintiff,

28 vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA

Related to CASE NO. 3:21-cv-07559-WHA

**DECLARATION OF JOCELYN MA IN
SUPPORT OF SONOS, INC.'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER
PARTY'S MATERIAL SHOULD BE
SEALED RE SONOS, INC.'S MOTION *IN*
LIMINE NO. 4 (DKT. NO. 598)**

I, Jocelyn Ma, declare and state as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of California and am admitted to practice before this Court. I am an associate at Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP representing Google LLC (“Google”) in this matter. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this Declaration, and if called as a witness I would testify competently to those matters.

2. I make this declaration in support of Sonos, Inc.’s (“Sonos”) Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material Should Be Sealed (“Administrative Motion”) (Dkt. 598) filed in connection with Sonos, Inc.’s (“Sonos”) Motion *in Limine* No. 4 (“Sonos’s Motion”) and Google’s Response to Motion *in Limine* No. 4 (“Google’s Response”). If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the information contained herein.

3. Google seeks an order sealing the materials as listed below:

Document	Portions Sonos Sought to Be Filed Under Seal	Portions Google Seeks to Be Filed Under Seal	Designating Party
Google’s Response	Portions highlighted in green	Portions highlighted in green	Google and Sonos
Exhibit 4 to Judah Declaration (“Exhibit 4”)	Portions outlined in red boxes	Portions outlined in red boxes	Google
Exhibit 8 to Judah Declaration (“Exhibit 8”)	Entire document	Entire document	Google and Sonos

4. I understand that this Court has analyzed sealing requests in connection with motions *in limine* pursuant to the “good cause” standard for non-dispositive motions. *See, e.g., Gearsources Holdings, LLC v. Google LLC*, No. 18-CV-03812-HSG, 2021 WL 1123630, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2021) (“Because Defendant’s motion *in limine* is not a dispositive motion, the Court applies the lower good cause standard.”); *Racies v. Quincy Bioscience, LLC*, No. 15-CV-00292-HSG, 2019 WL 8438448, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2019) (“Because the parties move to file documents related to their motions *in limine*, the Court will apply the lower good cause standard.”); *TVIIM, LLC v. McAfee, Inc.*, No. 13-CV-04545-HSG, 2015 WL 3776424, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 16, 2015) (“Because motions *in limine* are nondispositive motions, the Court applies the ‘good cause’ standard to the pending motions to seal.”). I also understand that material that is confidential and could harm a litigant’s competitive

standing if disclosed may be sealed under the good cause standard. *See, e.g., Skillz Platform Inc. v. AviaGames Inc.*, No. 21-CV-02436-BLF, 2022 WL 875654, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2022) (finding “good cause to file the documents and portions of documents at issue under seal given the sensitive financial and business information they contain”); *Dugan v. Lloyds TSB Bank, PLC*, No. 12-CV-02549-WHA NJV, 2013 WL 1435223, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2013) (“There may be ‘good cause’ to seal records that are privileged, contain trade secrets, contain confidential research, development or commercial information, or if disclosure of the information might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.”).

5. The portions of Google’s Response highlighted in green and Exhibit 8 contain information regarding a confidential agreement that is not public. I understand that public disclosure of this information would harm Google’s competitive standing and its ability to negotiate future licensing agreements by giving competitors access and insight into Google’s highly confidential business thinking and asymmetrical information about Google’s licensing strategies to other entities. If such information were made public, I understand that Google’s competitive standing would be significantly harmed. Google has therefore designated this information as HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY under the protective order (Dkt. 92). I also understand that this Court has previously granted sealing of the same and/or similar information. *See, e.g.,* Dkt. 334 at 5.

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

